

## **LSTA Advisory Committee Minutes (Draft)**

Crowne Plaza, April 20-21, 2010

**Present:** Pat Chevis, Jeff Dawson, Garrett Erickson, Becki George, Teri Iverson, Joan Johnson, Deb Kabler, Leah Langby, Pat Laughlin (and her dog's picture), Steve Platteter, Tasha Saecker, Michael Sheehan, Bob Stack, and Lynn Stainbrook.

**Absent:** Dee Barabe

**Division Staff:** Rick Grobschmidt, Mike Cross, Nancy Anderson, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe, Donna Steffan, Martha Berninger (Tue), David Sleasman (Wed)

Also present for Public Hearing: Tom Hennen, Debbie Cardinal, Peter Gilbert, Emily Pfotenhauer

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions by Terrie Howe, who asked members and visitors to introduce themselves.

Terrie reviewed the Agenda. No changes were requested.

### **Public Hearing Information**

Tom Hennen, Director Waukesha County Federated Library Service (WCFLS), spoke to the group at the public hearing about the Menomonie Falls and New Berlin libraries. These are a couple of the largest cities in the state and neither is part of the regional shared integrated library system. He explained how that transpired and why it may be advantageous to provide funding to help them to invest and participate in the regional shared system for all of Waukesha County. It would add about 87,000 additional residents included in the shared system. He asked for support to provide \$35,000 to each of the two libraries to help as part of the proposed category. He noted that WCFLS was one of the last systems to form a joint system, since they have many communities large enough to run their own, but it has been advantageous to convert and add them into the shared system. Mike Sheehan asked if each of the two communities is on board with the proposal. Hennen said that New Berlin is somewhat unknown since the director just retired. Menomonie Falls may be more difficult to convince, but they may not want to be left out alone, particularly with the long-term savings. Stainbrook asked how much the "little amount" of funds might be to sway them. Hennen said that the proposed amount, \$25,000 would be enough. Stainbrook asked if less would be enough to sway. Hennen said that, really, \$50,000 each would be better but he can understand the financial constraints.

Peter Gilbert, Director Lawrence University Library, spoke on behalf of the Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO) board, on which he has served. He presented the mission of WHO, the arrangement with WiLS, and the fact that support is still required since WiLS can no longer support the project. The proposal is to turn administration over to the Division for Libraries, Technology and Community Learning (DLTCL). The digital technology supports collaborative community learning, which Pete felt makes sense to place WHO within the DLTCL. Reasons to support the placement of WHO with the Division include:

1) That WHO collections represent good work that has inspired collaboration among many types of organizations. It is a fabulous resource, but it needs centralized support. WHO is continuing to grow. The

Division of Information Technology (DOIT) did harvest data last fall and came up with 10,000 more images. The collections within WHO complement the partnership with the University of Wisconsin Digital Collections Center (UWDCC) project. Training by WHO supplements that project for those who are not eligible for LSTA funds including local historical societies. By using some additional LSTA funding, the project could continue to grow.

2) Pete felt that Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO) was a good fit with DLTCL; the WHO resources are useful to all types of library users. The collections provide primary resources and DLTCL could promote and extend it into lifelong learning and K12 uses. DLTCL provides a good complement with several of its existing projects: digital archive, BadgerLink, and LSTA funding for UWDCC projects. By adding WHO, synergy can help to provide benefits to the entire state. Lots of collaboration, WHO complements existing partnerships, DLTCL can help support the use of the resources throughout the state; DLTCL can provide strong central leadership.

Joan Johnson asked whether there are fees paid by participants. Deb Cardinal mentioned the grant that has provided funding support and have offset fees to users. When the grant is over then the project, and Emily's position, could be in jeopardy. Johnson asked if it is possible that member fees could sustain the project. Gilbert said that was an initial goal, but that the fees did not prove feasible. Many participants are small, local grass-roots organizations that do not have funding. He feels it is a state resource that is worthy. Cardinal discussed the costs and ongoing considerations for the project, and how DoIT has helped to coordinate the project. Grobschmidt asked how many staff is supported. Response: Emily ¾ time and Cardinal on part-time. Johnson asked about use of the website over the years—whether there have been increasing. The UW statistics has gathered use. It has grown, but it is hard to get detail from that statistics report.

DeBacher asked about State Historical Society (SHS) and why that is not a better place for the WHO project. Gilbert said SHS was not willing to take it on. DeBacher asked about bridge funding until it might be encouraged to do so. He also asked Drew to explain the harvesting and searching. DeBacher asked further questions to clarify that, for the most part, the resources are hosted at disparate sites, with WHO serving as an umbrella for the searches, and as a server for very small organizations.

Stainbrook asked what would happen if no funding was provided. Gilbert said that the server for the smaller organizations might not be available, but that some of the larger organizations who have Content DM might be able to continue, although perhaps without new additions. Johnson asked how the collaborative piece would continue if the board is dissolved. Gilbert suggested that LITAC might serve as a board to continue the oversight of the project. Cardinal noted that she worked on WHO from June 2006 through June 2009, but then Emily took over the responsibilities. She explained Emily's role in working with smaller organizations to help them determine what would be appropriate to select elements for inclusion. Howe directed the committee's attention to the letter by Evan Bend of OWLS as support for WHO.

Howe also directed their attention to a letter from John Thompson, director of the Indianhead Federated Library System (IFLS) for *"Joining Shared Integrated Library Systems"* and *"Enhancing Shared Integrated Library Systems."* The letter from John Thompson emphasized the importance of completing participation in regional shared integrated library systems. Sheehan asked how many libraries are left in the state to join a shared system. Bocher said that 30 libraries are left throughout the state. Langby believes there are seven in Indianhead.

4. Minutes of November 11-12, 2009 meeting. Chevis moved to approve the minutes, Stainbrook seconded. Chevis noted the thoroughness and clarity of the minutes. Approved.

#### DLTCL Administrator's Remarks

Rick Grobschmidt welcomed the committee and thanked them for their volunteer work and noted that the new State Superintendent Tony Evers has visited a number of libraries. He takes special interest in the work of the public libraries and all libraries throughout the state. The Superintendent traditionally has accepted the recommendations from the LSTA committee and acted on their recommendations. Grobschmidt also reported on the LSTA funding variations over the year, and why some additional funds became available. He notes that the next budget looks to be pretty flat at the national and on the state level. That might affect consideration by the committee—that LSTA can help through the difficult time and can help support libraries through increasing needs and flat budgets.

#### 6. LSTA Coordinator's Report

Terrie directed the committee to the "Comment and Complaint" and the "Sanctions" documents. She explained that these were developed to address some deficiencies noted by the IMLS' review of the Wisconsin program, which they otherwise found to be well run. Howe noted that there is an appeals process included in the overall document (LSTA Information and Guidelines), but felt that a separate document might be more appropriate and easier to find. She noted that the sanctions may also help her in preparing the annual report that is mandatory, since she had a number of grants that did not satisfactorily complete their final evaluations or close out documentation. She also discussed the use of "mini-grants" or sub-grants where funds are automatically distributed to small libraries, since the individual recipients must, but often do not report back on the use of the funds. The proposed sanctions are intended to help enforce compliance with the LSTA grant process, not to punish libraries.

She noted that DLTCL obtained a "Connecting to Collections" grant from IMLS. Drew explained the project that she applied for and received on behalf of the Division for Libraries. There were planning grants available and the DPI has been awarded a grant of nearly \$40,000. This grant is to plan for the preservation of library materials in libraries throughout the state. She noted that the SHS preservation position has been vacant, so they were not in a position to apply. While the planning grant is not much, there are implementation grants available to apply for after planning takes place. She pointed out that IMLS' outlook on preservation does not necessarily focus on digitization, but the collaborative group she has assembled has that as a means toward that end. She hopes to build questions into a survey to find out what kinds of materials may be in libraries and how they might lend themselves to preservation. IMLS has a concern that most libraries do not have a plan for catastrophe. The Heritage Health Index provided some data. Howe asked about the consultant that would be used to help develop the plan and Drew noted that there would be an advisory committee.

(Martha from the Reference & Loan Library (RLL) joined the meeting)

#### **Procedures for Discussion of LSTA Grant Categories and Conflict of Interest Policy**

Cross asked if there were any questions on the proposed sanctions or possible elimination of the mini-grants. Howe clarified that only a few systems submit grants of this sort, where funds are distributed to the individual libraries instead of the system purchasing equipment and other resources as part of a grant, and then distributing the services or resources to participating libraries. Howe explained that there frequently was no follow-up or documentation of the use of funds within the libraries. Huntington

added clarification that some systems were distributing funds for disparate and perhaps vague purposes, so that the objectives of the grant became less focused. Alternatively, some systems will directly spend all of the money, and then distribute the resources, equipment, or services. Langby asked for clarification. Huntington gave some examples in the accessibility project. Howe said that it will also prevent occasions when funds are distributed and assumptions made that funds were spent, but they were not within the grant time frame and had to be returned to IMLS. Chevis noted that the libraries still should have to do an evaluation, or report to the system. Chevis asked if the committee could receive a summary each year of the deficiencies in the IMLS' review of the Annual Report.

Mike referred to the conflict of interest policy on page 19 of the guidelines and the language regarding establishing a non-competitive grant category, or any action in which the committee member might be a direct beneficiary of the project.

### **Preliminary LSTA Budget 2010 & 2011 Overview**

Mike directed the committee's attention to the green LSTA 2011 budget sheets. He noted changes in the Library Improvement line to \$126,300, a downward adjustment of the budget because Bocher received some administrative funding from the Gates grants. We are also proposing \$10,000 for 2010 Broadband Upgrade Grants. Libraries will have some local costs that were not possible to be determined at the time of the grant application (such as electrical or entry-point changes to accommodate the new circuit). This money is designated to help libraries do necessary upgrading of wiring, electrical work, etc. prior to installation of fiber broadband in the libraries.

Cross also explained the extra \$53,214; this was an amount greater than the anticipated allocation. This was due to a one time release of accumulated funds by IMLS. That increase will not be available in subsequent years, since the President requested flat funding for the program in the next budget. The actual DLTCL carryover of funds to 2010 was also more than anticipated primarily because of vacant DLTCL positions. The Division has proposed some uses of those funds, indicated with asterisks.

Bob Bocher reported on the \$25 million broadband grant for fiber benefitting libraries' and schools' network connections. Sally reminded the group of the WHO discussion, and had identified one area that could and should be done immediately—the harvesting of new materials added throughout the libraries, so that the resources could be identified and included in search results. The DLTCL proposes that \$7200 be allocated in the current budget year (2010) in order to take care of one-time cost of setting up to add new collections. This fee would go to DoIT at the UW Madison.

Barb discussed the Learning Express program that had been purchased by many systems under the Jobs category. DPI hopes to coordinate a statewide contract with some of the additional 2010 funds, if it can be justified as a sole-source purchase through DOA. The cost is estimated for the latter half of 2010 and the first half of 2011 when it is hoped that the resource can be integrated into the state BadgerLink budget in future years.

## ***Preliminary Grant Categories for 2011***

### **Technology**

#### **Delivery Service**

Drew discussed the cost factors that are considered in the backbone delivery system formula. LSTA has been subsidizing the costs for years. The proposed amount of \$75,000 to SCLS and \$15,000 to NWLS would be the same as the current year.

#### **Digitization – Local Resources**

Sally noted the category has been around since 2005. Some funding is provided to eligible libraries, and all applicants have to work with the UW-Digital Collections Center (UWDCC). The UW does the actual scanning, and provides high-resolution copies back to the library, and commits to a specific level of quality in their technology. Libraries using the project have been able to carry out projects they otherwise could not have done themselves. There is still a fair amount of documentation and metadata work that the local libraries have to provide when submitting materials for digitization. Howe said that Vicki Tobias has been the project coordinator and noted that some of the grant applications in 2010 were not specific in what volume or type of materials would be handled. Next year, all libraries will have to be clearer in their proposals. Johnson asked that the requirement be indicated in the new guidelines. Stack asked if the UWDCC has the ability to make a physical facsimile of the item. Howe suspects that any physical output would have to be done by the library from the high-resolution images provided.

#### **Digitization – Large Libraries**

Drew noted that these projects have allowed some of the larger libraries that are able to conduct the scanning and hosting themselves to be included in the overall project to make the resources available to a larger audience. Four libraries would be eligible; three libraries applied last year. The other stipulation is that the recipient could not spend more money per image than the UWDCC (or the library would bear those higher costs themselves). She is proposing that the category be continued for another year.

#### **Library Improvement: Technology**

Mike Cross referred to page 5 of the handouts, with the corrected amount of \$126,300, due to the Gates Online Opportunity grant that will cover some costs for 2011. He noted that Bocher did most of the writing and background work for the successful federal broadband grant, for which the committee gave Bob a round of applause.

#### **Public Library System Technology**

Bob continued, referring to page 6 of the preliminary categories' handout. The handout referenced the possible awards based on a base amount as well as a population and system area formula for distribution.

#### **Joining Shared Integrated Library Systems \*\* New for this year**

Bob discussed the resurrection of the Joining Shared ILS grant, with a proposed amount of \$75,000. It has not been an LSTA category for about four years and there have been several who have indicated that it should be revisited to allow those few libraries one more time to take advantage of the program. He noted the appeal by Tom Hennen in the public comments. Eligibility amounts are broken down by size of community. He noted that the category purposes state that funding would not be available beyond 2011. Sheehan asked for a summary of the results of the email survey that was sent out to

systems polling system director's response to this proposed previous category. Bob noted that IFLS and WCFLS system supplied positive responses; one or two said that libraries had their chance and the category should not be reinstated, but others said they had no problem with the category but that the economy may make it difficult to convince libraries to join. Erickson asked about the merging shared system category. Stainbrook asked if he meant that the category should perhaps be expanded to allow for the inclusion of a library system's ILS merging with another system's ILS. He explained that, with the economy as it is, that may be attractive. Cross said there had been a similar category in two recent years. IFLS carried out one of the grants. Stack noted that more libraries in SCLS might be interested, and wondered if there would be enough funds available. He has concerns that some may be interested but may not be eligible. Bocher noted that the indication that the category would not be available beyond 2011 was only to indicate that there would not be long-term availability. He suggested that if there is considerable interest or indication that other libraries might be interested in subsequent years, perhaps the category then could be continued.

#### **Enhancing Use of Technology in Libraries and Library Systems (competitive)\*\***

(Name change since the originally suggested *Enhanced Shared Integrated Library systems*

Bob continued with a proposed category for systems which would be competitive. He believes it is important that the applicants justify the benefits to the patrons to rank the validity of the grants. Stainbrook wonders if the systems that share a system would be eligible for two grants. He suggested that clarifying language could be added. Platteter asked if it could be used to merge systems. Bocher said he had not considered that but the committee might entertain that notion.

#### **Reference and Loan**

Drew referred the members to the handout and noted that a full-time reference staff person had been cut from state general funds, but has not been added to the LSTA funding. Some of the costs that support the digitization categories and others were shifted by DPI to the LSTA budget and the increases are reflected in the category here. The state superintendent had approved reallocation last year. She did not request any new funding. Note that there has been a corresponding cut in the WISCAT services. Stainbrook said she appreciates the detail of statistics that were included in the narrative. She asked about the increases in reference requests and asked if that is attributable to AskAway. Drew confirmed the increases. Erickson asked about the document depository program, and Drew discussed the process and efficacy of harvesting electronic governmental resources and making those available to searches. Some systems are adding those records to their ILS automated systems.

#### **Virtual Reference**

Drew reported the progress since the program started in 2006. Since a model for charging libraries and recovering costs never worked, the costs are being absorbed into LSTA. Berninger noted the drop in "web forms" questions as a more successful effort to weed out spam emails. Drew said that the program now picks up the OCLC costs for the public libraries that are participating in answering questions. Next year the primary increase would be the increased assessments by OCLC. She noted that R&LL took over the administrative function that WiLS formerly carried out. Martha noted that more systems have opted out of participation, so that the addition of a half-time reference librarian, hours were added so that there is daily staffing by a Wisconsin librarian throughout the week, which helps the metrics for within-state question answers. The opportunity to expand the use of the program into schools is very exciting. Stainbrook asked about the texting question option. Berninger discussed trial opportunities for a utility to allow such questions. She said that they are trying very hard to add a Spanish language queue, which will only be available once the state can offer 10 hours of staffing.

## **WISCAT**

Sally noted that enough vendors adhere to standards to allow the virtual catalog to supplant the union catalog and provide the primary services to Wisconsin searches. Since so many records were taken out of the union catalog, authority control will no longer be run. They also are working on other enhancements.

## **Statewide Library Access**

Drew expressed a disclaimer that this is a project she has assisted in, but was requested by COLAND. She is working with a group, a couple of meetings have been held to clarify the purpose and scope, and they have begun to draft some protocols and identified funding difficulties. The total two-year costs are anticipated to be \$38,000, using carryover for the second year. Laughlin asked how much the consultant costs are. Drew reported \$3000 initially and certainly no more than \$2000 next year, but that he is a very good facilitator for the project.

4:00          Adjourn for the day

**Wednesday, April 21:** called back to order at 8:38 am

## **Special Needs**

### **Accessibility**

Barb Huntington outlined the direction of the category, and the fact that some sparsely populated, geographically large systems still have significant unmet accessibility needs. Consequently she recommends that the category be set as competitive for 2011 in order to better validate the grant needs and give lower population systems a chance to catch up and obtain larger grants. The proposed amount is \$125,000. Stainbrook asked whether lever-style door handles are allowed. Huntington said it generally is allowed as long as it does not require widening the door. Cross noted that there is a limit of \$2000 per door for adding automatic door openers. Huntington related two stories of door retrofits in the IFLS area. DeBacher suggested that door width issues cannot be addressed, but that retrofit of handles to an existing door is allowed. Iverson asked about light fixtures (motion controlled), whether that would be considered an accessibility issue. Huntington said that does not necessarily fall into accessibility. Iverson clarified whether systems would apply for all libraries in their area or only on behalf of some. Huntington said it could be done either way. Laughlin said the systems will need some help in explaining the category to make it clear to libraries. Stainbrook asked what impact it would be to make individual libraries eligible. Huntington said she believes that having systems coordinate the grants works better in preparing the applications. Stainbrook suggested that, since it is competitive, perhaps it could be open to individual libraries. Iverson noted that some libraries have updated their sound system and incorporated hearing assistance. She wondered if that would be allowable.

### **Job Support**

Barb explained that this category was originally an emergency response of surplus funds to address the economic downturn, but has continued to provide support through the recovery process. She would like it to continue as a competitive project to address specific situations. She noted, too, that many libraries have supplemented services for job training and searching. Funding to help libraries support the work that job centers have struggled to accommodate would be very useful if properly targeted. Chevis noted a place to make a correction to indicate that individual libraries can also apply for the grants (not solely

systems). Grobschmidt expressed thanks to the library development team to quickly address the economic situation. He also mentioned that another DPI team has worked with PLD to place Vistas and Ameri-Corps to support library programs. Huntington noted that she attended a jobs summit conducted by IMLS and that the grant applications helped her prepare and report on Wisconsin success stories.

### **Literacy**

Barb outlined the broad range of needs that can be addressed in the category. \$100,000 is requested for the category despite it having been funded as high as \$322,000 in 2003. However, since there are several special needs categories, systems may not be able to accommodate writing and implementing several large-scale grants. Chevis asked whether literacy grants still need to require purchase of GED materials and if it could be removed. Huntington noted that, if the Learning Express service is obtained statewide, that need may be better addressed through that software, so the requirement could be removed. Howe noted that Learning Express should be noted as a bullet-point in the list of programs, since it will carry into 2011 if the negotiations succeed. Stainbrook subsequently asked what the maximum amount will be to apply for. Huntington said that there is no maximum amount.

Terrie Howe noted David Sleasman's attendance at the meeting.

## **Library Improvement**

### **Communications and Planning**

Rick Grobschmidt outlined the committees and projects that are funded—COSLA, COLAND, LITAC and publications, but that the printing and mailing of *Channel* was eliminated by publishing it solely as an online publication.

### **LSTA Administration**

Howe noted that funds are retained to cover a maximum of 4% of grant funds for administration of the grants. One tenth of her salary, LSTA committee costs and training for grant reviewers, printing and mailing as well as the indirect DPI charges are all part of this category.

### **School Library Media Staffing Summit**

Nancy Anderson thanked the group for funding the summit and noted that the discussion may be the only way to address the situation of diminishing school library media positions in public schools. She indicated that the planning and discussion would need to continue next year. COLAND requested the summit, rather than simply a consultant study, but there is a commitment to carry on activities beyond the summit meetings. Stainbrook noted that she has attended as a public library representative and felt the meeting were well facilitated, but hopes that school district administrators will heed the outcomes of the planning groups. Anderson noted that there is a school board president and an office of the association of school boards also attending, who have asked good questions about the profession and they have become good advocates. Laughlin noted the crisis in her school district and adjacent districts. Laughlin also said she would share the results with her board and her community. Iverson pointed out difficulties in school districts in her region where, not only have media specialists been eliminated, but then special-interest elements on the school board go into the libraries to remove collection resources. Stainbrook pointed out the different needs and purpose of what public libraries can provide versus the school needs. Howe noted that media specialists must be able to bring more to the school setting than managing the books and collection—21<sup>st</sup> Century school skills, technology support, outreach to students can all help support the need of the library media specialist's position.

### **Statewide Library Improvement**

Mike Cross referred to page 30 of the handout, noting public library development staffing (80% of his, 100% of Huntington, and 50% data collection position in 2010). He noted that the GPR funding for Zimmerman's position was lost in the budget process. He noted that Zimmerman is working part-time in that role now. The category also supports the Summer Library Program (SLP), and annual meetings of system consultants in several areas, as well as continuing education for team staff.

Chevis asked whether the Division could explain why several categories were dropped: *Health Information*, and *Innovative Use of Technology* and *Multi-type library collaboration*. She noted the minutes indicated that the *Innovative* category had been discussed previously for improvement, not elimination. Bocher explained the progress, or lack thereof, in the "innovative" nature of the program. He suggested that the projects that had come in and were funded could be addressed through the block grants, but also the funding could be better applied to the shared ILS category. The Innovative category was difficult to administer and qualify, particularly in validating the "uniqueness" of the category. Chevis agreed in general, but noted that when the category was initiated, the gaming applications really were innovative. But she noted that there is no place in the LSTA categories for an individual library to go to apply for funds to try something new at a very local level. There is much changing in technology for libraries, but no support to do that. Bocher noted that systems are not precluded from applying the system technology grants to individual libraries for trial projects. Chevis said that the conversation last spring focused more on how to make the category truly innovative, and that the burden could have been directed on the reviewers. Cross said that many of the grants have simply not been innovative. Howe said that all had been funded, but none were particularly innovative. Chevis suggested that those grants did not necessarily have to be funded, and the requirement could have been emphasized. Stainbrook said she did a quick addition and noted that only the \$60,000 in digitization, and the job search or literacy were the only categories open to individual libraries. She said that if a library is in a system that does not do a good job of drafting and applying for the grants, they have no chance for funding.

Howe reported that the quality and limited number of applications in the Health category has led to the staff recommendation to eliminate the category. Drew noted the availability and expansion of new consumer health resources in Badgerlink, but that it is difficult make the public aware of those resources. DeBacher noted the staff had to acknowledge that, although there is a one-time increase in LSTA funding, the next two years are likely to be flat funded, at best, requiring more of a focus of resources rather than an expansion of offerings. Stainbrook noted that last year she championed the Health category but was disappointed at the results. Chevis noted there is as much need in the Health category as in the jobs category. She pointed out that Michelle Obama has made obesity a personal campaign. Laughlin noted that her library occupies the same building as the public health department and they work with them for displays and information. Johnson said, too, that the Milwaukee health department takes the lead in her area on health. She noted that the committee has limited resources and needs to focus its efforts. Kabler added that, if the health care could be brought down to the community level the results could be useful in her community (Barneveld). Her community does not have a health department and only recently obtained a clinic. Stainbrook suggested including health information literacy within the literacy category. She said that health literacy could be useful. Huntington said that Wisconsin Literacy, Inc has a drive in progress with such a purpose, but the category must target literacy needs, and if done properly, even financial literacy can be addressed. Stainbrook confirmed that poverty is considered a special need.

Howe reported that the multi-type category had three grants, but that one in particular was misdirected and should have been in another category. She noted that Statewide Library Access category is an effort to expand multi-type library use. George noted that collaboration comes up frequently, but she is particularly disappointed that the category has been dropped. She felt that the offering was out-of-the-box thinking for the group and that it may be premature to discontinue the category, particularly since the three grants were funded. She noted that she would have worked on a grant, except that there were personnel changes among her staff, the public library, and the technical college. She would like to see the category continued for another year. Since it is the smallest-funded competitive category, it would not take many resources to continue. Howe asked what type of collaboration she would like to see. George noted that the public library catalog records could be expanded to include lexile levels to assist directed reading during the Summer Library Program. She said that communication to reduce redundancy of services and sharing of collections. She noted, too, that collaboration between CESAs and the library systems could also be effective.

Stack said Huntington stated earlier that a \$3000 grant is limiting for someone to apply for and wondered whether a \$6000 grant would have some of the same problem. Huntington said that the resource director had told her that a federal grant of less than \$10,000 is more difficult than it is worth. Sheehan wondered whether, when the funding is distributed, how much carryover is up for consideration. Cross said that the carryover is already included in the available funds on the budget sheet. Cross and Howe noted that recommendations can be made for additional categories.

Chevis asked about the Learning Express category and wanted to clarify that it will not be carried beyond 2011. Cross and Grobschmidt noted that the intent is to start it with LSTA funds, but then to fold it into the Superintendent's budget and include it in the request to the Governor's budget as an added resource for BadgerLink. Anderson asked whether the existing categories, such as Jobs, whether other types of applicants could be included, without including more categories.

Break at 10:15

Stainbrook wondered if the shared system category could be expanded to individual libraries and thereby allow innovation technology to be incorporated in that category. Chevis said that the use of funds could be free-standing technology instead of the ILS. Bocher said it could be included and broadened. Chevis said she would prefer to see it as a free-standing category. She feels it has been a well-used category. She feels we should be providing opportunities for individual libraries to achieve funding. Promotion should be done to inform libraries that innovation can be considered in the *Enhancing Shared Systems* category.

### **Consideration of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2011**

Cross explained the process.

Chevis moved delivery at \$90,000, seconding by Stainbrook. Carried, with Sheehan abstaining.

Stainbrook recommended *Communications & Planning* at \$20,000, *Library Improvement* at \$350,900, and the *School Summit* at \$35,000, seconded by Sheehan. Carried unanimously

Johnson recommended and Dawson seconded that the *Jobs* category be funded at \$200,000. Sheehan said that, if a certain amount of *Learning Express* is funded, could this amount be lower? Huntington said that it would be about \$41,000, but there is no guarantee. Grobschmidt noted that the vendor agreement would require refunds to systems that have already paid. Drew reported on the process and

how much longer it would take. She noted that the current year's period is waning. If she needs to go out to bid, the process could take until the end of the year. She believes there is a good case for sole-source. The motion carried unanimously.

Erickson requested the *LSTA Administration* category at the stated amount. (\$126,975) Motion was seconded by Johnson. The motion carried unanimously.

Chevis moved to approve the two *digitization categories* as requested, seconded by Stack. The motion carried without discussion.

Dawson moved the *R&LL* requested amount, seconded by Chevis. The motion carried without discussion.

Stainbrook moved the *Learning Express* project at \$103,750, seconded by Langby. The motion carried without discussion.

Stainbrook moved *Statewide Library Access* at \$15,000, seconded by Johnson. The motion carried without discussion.

*WISCAT* Chevis, Kabler at the recommended amount \$569,250. The motion carried without discussion.

Stack moved the *Broadband upgrade grants*, seconded by Sheehan at \$15,500. The motion carried without discussion.

Erickson moved *Accessibility*, seconded by Dawson at \$125,000. The motion carried without discussion.

George moved the *Literacy Projects*, seconded by Iverson, at the recommended amount of \$100,000. Stainbrook wondered if this includes the expansion of the category to include the Health Care literacy. That language is proposed as a friendly amendment. The motion carried without discussion.

George moved *Multi-type* category back in, at the prior year amount of \$25,000, seconded by Sheehan. Chevis asked George whether there is a way to include or encourage collaboration under other categories. George said she would prefer that it remain a stand-alone category. She feels the category needs to be more visible, and noted that she and Langby are now best friends through their collaboration during break. Chevis asked Division staff what is the scope of Division staff for multi-type planning and services; Cross noted from the statutes the need of systems for cooperation and continuous planning with other types of libraries. Laughlin noted that multi-type may be a worthy category, but wonders where the money for the category will come from in the budget. Sheehan noted that less will need to be budgeted for another category. Stainbrook noted that last year the multi-type category had a maximum of \$2500 that could be requested and perhaps the maximum could be increased. George said that discussion had indicated that small grant applications are difficult to attract, and that a higher amount would be helpful. Langby said that more language delineating the category is needed. Johnson said that the application amounts should be allowed to be as large as possible. Stack has concerns that the category should be available only if funds become available. Cross confirmed that the carryover is already included in the budget. Johnson wondered who would develop the language. George said her language had been included last year and she could develop more. Stainbrook suggested members submit language. Language would be worked on by several committee members with Howe via email.

George suggested that the Jobs category could be reduced to \$175,000, but would have to be approved. Laughlin wondered if the committee should stick to some of the new categories already approved. There were increases in current categories. Drew said that R&LL and Virtual Reference could not be reduced. George wondered if Joining Shared Systems could be eliminated or reduced, since that category had already been eliminated. Chevis wondered if the Learning Express amount of \$41,000 could have been saved. She suggested reducing the category to \$175,000 since funds are also going to Learning Express. Langby noted that the Jobs search category has a large number of applicants, and there likely will be a large amount of interest. Stainbrook suggested voting and decide the reductions at the end of the process. The motion carried.

Stainbrook recommended Library Improvement in Technology and seconded by Dawson at \$126,300. The motion carried without discussion. Bocher noted the reduction in cost for next year was due to the Gates grant.

Platteter recommended *Joining Shared Systems* at \$75,000, seconded by Langby. Stack abstained from the vote. Stainbrook opposed the motion.

Chevis recommended *Enhancing Shared Integrated Library Systems* at \$100,000, expanding it to include public libraries and other types of technology. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion carried without further discussion.

Iverson moved, seconded by Chevis, to fund *Virtual Reference* at the recommended amount. Drew said that the project has been collaborative and multi-type in its design. Laughlin opposed the motion which carried.

Dawson moved *Public Library Systems Technology* projects at \$350,000, seconded by Stack at the recommended amount. Carried with Sheehan abstaining.

Cross noted that recommendations now exceeded the projected budget amounts by \$27,933. It was noted by Chevis that the WHO proposal has not been included. Johnson said that if the WHO board proposal would include dissolve WHO responsibilities transferring to DLTCL with no other plans for future operations, she could not support WHO as a proposal for LSTA funding. Johnson had thought that the State Historical Society was the intended source in the future. She is concerned that LSTA is looked upon as emergency continuing funding in too many situations. Drew said that the Nicholas Foundation Grant may be continued into 2011. Chevis suggested that a discussion and vote should be undertaken to give a formal response to their proposal.

Stainbrook moved to reconsider the *Joining Shared ILS* to include merging two shared systems, since that option did not seem clear to her. George noted that that possibility may be intended within the *Enhancing Shared Systems* category. She asked Bocher for his reaction. He replied that, if properly justified, it may be considered, but the guidelines would have to be revised. At the same time, it may be a late juncture at this date to entertain proposals for such a considerable task. Sheehan wondered if the two categories could be combined. Platteter noted he had asked about that yesterday. Bocher noted that the *Enhancing* category is competitive, whereas *Joining Shared Integrated systems* is not competitive and it would be difficult to mix the two. Langby wonders what happens if too many libraries submit applications in Joining than there is available funding. Bocher said he did not anticipate a

problem. Stainbrook said she had heard an interest in ILS's joining together and perhaps it should be encouraged.

Stack suggested Joining/Merging as a change in the category name. Bocher noted that the intent is more to get libraries that already are not part of a shared ILS. Stainbrook expressed some skepticism—since the libraries already have an ILS, so the benefit for the state is easier availability of those resources, but she is not sure about the benefit to the rest of the state. Bocher said that it is beneficial at the system level to bring in other libraries not already participating. Sheehan asked if it would be possible to get collateral benefit in the statewide library access project. Johnson asked if all systems offer a shared ILS. Bocher confirmed that is the case and said that the intent is to reduce the number of stand-alone systems. Stainbrook noted that the impetus should be to get individual libraries to join existing systems, not to form new consortia. Stack said “never mind” with is suggested category name change!

Erickson said that he agrees that the incentive should be to pool system resources to save on interlibrary loan. Bocher confirmed to Johnson that merging shared systems had been a category. Johnson said that systems could approach LSTA in the future. Stack suggested that such merges could be considered an enhancement of shared systems. Platteter noted that he is somewhat torn on the issue. While MWFLS has worked well this has only been because there was a definite interest in sharing resources. SHARE (the integrated library system name within the Mid-Wisconsin Federated Library System) came about only because there was an interest at the time. The main concern should be to share resources. He also noted that \$25,000 in Enhancement would not be enough to confirm large-scale combinations. Kabler noted that SWLS and WRLS had looked at options in combining systems.

Stainbrook wondered whether the number of people served could be considered in weighing the *Enhanced* category. Bocher said that different vendors charge different ways for new modules—some are flat fees, others are weighted by criteria such as population. Sheehan asked how much consideration is taken in population served. Howe said that the reviewers may consider it, but that it depends on the category. Cross suggested that reviewers might consider the dollar amount and the population served.

Stack moved to take \$5000 from Digitization Large Libraries and reduce that category amount from \$30,000 to \$25,000, removed \$5000 from Joining Shared ILSs (to \$70,000), remove \$10,000 from Multi-type library collaboration (to \$15,000), and the remaining \$7933 from the Job Search category (to \$192,067). Johnson seconded the motion.

Chevis moved that it is inappropriate to use LSTA funds to support the WHO project. Johnson supported the motion. Chevis said that so much is unknown and the costs could be so large. She added that the more appropriate role that the State Historical Society should play in such a project. Long term funding through LSTA is not an attractive option. Johnson said the initial plan for the project to be self sustaining was not workable, and the group did not present a budget. It is a considerable amount to take on. The motion carried unanimously not to fund WHO.

Stack asked Bocher whether the ceiling for the *Joining Shared Library Systems* could be lowered since the total had been reduced. Bocher thought dropping the ceiling to \$20,000 might not be inappropriate. Stainbrook said that adjustment could be made in the fall. Bocher said that is not a good practice since the libraries will need to be able to anticipate an amount in a grant that has been approved by its board. Bocher answered Langby that, if the threshold is reached, then the larger libraries are first served to benefit the maximum population.

### **Review of LSTA Process for 2011 (Terrie) Guidelines, LSTA Timetable, Review Process, Application Form, Rating Criteria**

In regard to the application form, Stainbrook noted that when she had reviewed in a category, she and the other reviewers were not happy with the quality of the grants received. She cannot think of elements in the grant application that could be improved. Small consideration could be given to move the abstract to later in the application since that should really be drafted after the grant is developed.

Huntington said there would be specific instruction on the Accessibility category for assistance on that grant. George added that the guidelines booklet needs to be disseminated more broadly. WEMTA and the PK12 listservs were mentioned.

Howe asked about scheduling the next meeting in November, whether the 9-10 or the 16-17. The latter dates work better.

Grobschmidt offered final comments, thanking the committee and asking the committee to thank the DLTCL staff in their fine job in working on the LSTA program. Howe thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

The committee adjourned at 11:55 am.

Minutes taken by John DeBacher

\*\*      New categories from DPI staff